



The Big Sky Country

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SPONSOR'S REBUTTAL TO FISCAL NOTE

House Bill Number: HB245 (Fiscal Note 2) **Date Prepared:** 3/20/15

Short Title: **Revise laws related to raw milk**

Sponsor: **Nancy Ballance**

Generally, why do you disagree with the fiscal note?

Estimated number of producers is overstated. The bill was amended to require testing to be paid by consumers yet testing costs are still included. 0.5 FTE is far more than is required for issuing the small number of permits that will be required.

Specifically, what in the fiscal note do you feel is flawed?

(Describe specific assumptions, calculations, technical issues, etc.)

1. The department estimated there would be 70 producers. Our estimate is there will be only 30 producers.
 2. Producers are required to pay for testing so the department costs should not be included for testing.
 3. It should not be necessary to add 0.5 FTE in the Department of Livestock to administer this program for 30 producers.
-

What is your estimate of the fiscal impact?

Department of Livestock biennial costs:

\$1,000 to develop rules

\$(600) collected from permitting fees

\$5,500 for 0.125 FTE to administer the program and process permits and fees

\$5,900 Total per biennium

Sponsor Signature:

Nancy Ballance

HB 245#2 Page 1 of 1